

### REMARKS

Favorable reconsideration of the application is respectfully requested in light of the amendments and remarks herein.

Upon entry of this amendment, claims 8-13 will be pending. By this amendment, claims 8 and 13 have been amended. No new matter has been added.

#### §112 Rejection of Claim 13

In Section 4 of the Office Action, claim 13 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph. Claim 13 has been amended, thereby obviating this rejection.

Accordingly, it is submitted that the Examiner's rejection of claim 13 based upon 35 U.S.C. §112 has been obviated and withdrawal thereof is respectfully requested.

#### § 102 Rejection of Claims 8-10 and 13

In Section 5 of the Office Action, claims 8-10 and 13 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Matsuzaki *et al.* (U.S. Patent 6,289,314; hereinafter referred to as "Matsuzaki"). Claims 8 and 13 have been amended to address the rejection.

In the Background section of the Specification, it was disclosed that "[i]f a user possesses two or more information processing apparatuses, he/she must purchase content and settle its usage charge for each information processing apparatus, which causes a problem ..." *Page 1, lines 19-21 of the Specification.*

To solve the above-described problem, embodiments of the present invention provide system and method for processing media contents to enable the flow of the media contents from a content provider directly to information processing apparatus(es). For example, the structure

of an information processing system of claim 8, as presented herein, includes:

*“at least one information processing apparatus;*

*a control apparatus configured to enable the flow of said media contents from said content provider directly to said at least one information processing apparatus; and*

*a master information processing apparatus in communication with said at least one information processing apparatus and said control apparatus, said master information processing apparatus including:*

*a first transmitter to transmit appropriate proxy account settlement information to said at least one information processing apparatus;*

*a first receiver to receive accounting information from said at least one information processing apparatus sent in response to said proxy account settlement information, said accounting information related to payment for said media contents, said media contents received directly by said at least one information processing apparatus from said content provider, said first receiver generating payment information when said accounting information is processed;*

*a second transmitter to transmit said payment information to said control apparatus; and*

*a second receiver to receive registration conditions from said control apparatus, said registration conditions prepared in response to receiving said payment information from the master information processing apparatus that settles payment for media contents received directly by said at least one information processing apparatus.”*

*(emphasis added)*

Therefore, the information processing system of claim 8 enables the flow of the media contents from the content provider directly to the at least one information processing apparatus once the payment for the media contents has been settled with the control apparatus through the master information processing apparatus.

By contrast, Matsuzaki indicates that server 2 (see FIG. 1 of Matsuzaki) receives media contents (stated as “pay information” in Matsuzaki; in contrast, the term “payment information”

in claim 8 is stated as “a charge for using the pay information” in Matsuzaki) and distributes the media contents to each terminal 3. “The server 2 receives the pay information transmitted from the transmitting stations TS and distributes the pay information to each terminal 3. The server 2 also manages use situations of the pay information at each terminal 3 based on a request from each terminal 3, and calculates a charge for using the pay information at each terminal 3 from the use situations.” *Matsuzaki, column 13, lines 23-29.*

Based on the foregoing discussion, it is maintained that Matsuzaki fails to teach or suggest all the limitations recited in claim 8. Therefore, claim 8 should be allowable over Matsuzaki. Since claims 9-10 depend from claim 8, claims 9-10 should also be allowable over Matsuzaki. Further, since method claim 13 closely parallels, and includes substantially similar limitations as recited in, system claim 8, claim 13 should also be allowable over Matsuzaki.

Accordingly, it is submitted that the Examiner’s rejection of claims 8-10 and 13 based upon 35 U.S.C. §102(e) has been overcome by the present remarks and withdrawal thereof is respectfully requested.

#### § 103 Rejection of Claims 11 and 12

In Section 6 of the Office Action, claims 11 and 12 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Matsuzaki as applied to claim 8 above.

Claims 11 and 12 depend from claim 8 and, thus, include all the limitations of claim 8. Based on the foregoing discussion regarding Matsuzaki with respect to claim 8, it is maintained that claims 11 and 12 should be allowable over Matsuzaki.

Accordingly, it is submitted that the Examiner's rejection of claims 11 and 12 based upon 35 U.S.C. §103(a) has been overcome by the present remarks and withdrawal thereof is respectfully requested.

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, entry of this amendment, and the allowance of this application with claims 8-13 are respectfully solicited.

In regard to the claims amended herein and throughout the prosecution of this application, it is submitted that these claims, as originally presented, are patentably distinct over the prior art of record, and that these claims were in full compliance with the requirements of 35 U.S.C. §112. Changes that have been made to these claims were not made for the purpose of patentability within the meaning of 35 U.S.C. §§101, 102, 103 or 112. Rather, these changes were made simply for clarification and to round out the scope of protection to which Applicant is entitled.


In the event that additional cooperation in this case may be helpful to complete its prosecution, the Examiner is cordially invited to contact Applicant's representative at the telephone number written below.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any insufficient fees or credit any overpayment associated with the above-identified application to Deposit Account 50-0320.

Respectfully submitted,

FROMMER LAWRENCE & HAUG LLP

By:

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Samuel S. Lee, Reg. No. 42,791 for  
William S. Frommer  
Reg. No. 25,506  
(212) 588-0800